

The 29th November, 1994.

No. 14/13/87-6 Lab./954.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hisar, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of the Vice Chancellor, H.A.U., Hissar vs. Beer Singh.

BEFORE SHRI B. R. VOHRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, HISAR.

Reference No. 689 of 90

Date of Receipt : 14.9.89

Date of Decision : 2.11.94

SHRI BEER SINGH, SON OF CHOTTU RAM,
C/O MAZDOOR EKTA UNION, HISAR,

... Applicant.

versus

(1) VICE-CHANCELLOR, HARYANA AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITY, HISAR.
(2) SUB DIVISIONAL OFFICER, (WORKSHOP)
HARYANA AGRICULTURE UNIVERSITY,
HISAR. ... Respondent/Management.

Present :

Shri Bhagwant Dayal, for the workman.

Shri L. S. Bajia, for the management.

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short, 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Beer Singh and the above mentioned management for adjudication to this Court.—*vide* Labour Department letter No. Hsr/118-89/38436-42, dated 6th September, 1989 :—

Whether services of Beer Singh were terminated or he left the job by absenting himself ? In either event, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. According to the workman, he was appointed as Blacksmith labour under the management on 6th February, 1982 and that he was removed from service in June, 1986, without giving him any notice and without paying him any retrenchment compensation. The workman has, therefore, pleaded that the termination of his services being in violation of Sections 25-F and 25-G of the Act, was illegal. He, therefore, prayed for reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. The management, in its written statement, while admitting that the workman was appointed as daily paid labour on 6th February,

1982, contended that the workman left the job himself on 19th May, 1986 without informing the management. The management therefore, pleaded that there was no occasion to serve any notice or charge-sheet on the workman. It was also pleaded that the workman did not approach the management after 19th May, 1986 till the date of filing of demand notice in 1989 for re-employment. Several preliminary objections were also raised, as they are reflected in the following issues, framed on 29th November, 1990 by my learned predecessor :—

- (1) As per terms of reference.
- (2) Whether claim petition is not maintainable ?
- (3) Whether the claim is barred by time ?
- (4) Whether the workman is estopped from filing the claim petition ?
- (5) Relief.

4. The parties led evidence in support of their rival claims. I have heard Shri Bhagwant Dayal, authorised representative of the workman and Shri L. S. Bajia, authorised representative of the management and have gone through the case file. My findings on the above issues are as under :—

ISSUE NO. 1 :

5. According to Beer Singh, WW-1, he worked as Blacksmith under the management from 6th February, 1982 to June, 1986, when he was removed from the job without issuing him any notice and without paying him any retrenchment compensation. In his cross-examination, he admitted that he did not raise any finger against the termination of his services in June, 1986, till 20th March, 1989, when he raised the demand notice.

6. According to Gurdial Singh, MW-1, the workman has worked from 1982 till 19th May, 1986, whereafter he left the job at his own. He also proved the copy of the reply given by the management before the Labour cum-Conciliation Officer, Hisar as Ex. W-1.

7. From a perusal of the reply Ex. W-1, given by the management before Conciliation Officer, and the pleadings raised in the written statement, it would be evident that it was the consistent case of the management from the beginning that the workman himself left the job from 19th May, 1986 and this plea of the manage-

ment. is supported by the fact that the workman kept silent for about 3 years thereafter and did not raise any finger against his termination till 20th March, 1989, when he raised the demand notice. No explanation is forthcoming as to why the workman kept mum for all these 3 years and though an explanation is given in the demand notice, but surprisingly Beer Singh, WW-1 has not uttered a word in this regard, when he entered the witness box on 26th August, 1991. Taking an over-all view of these circumstances, it can legitimately be inferred that it is a case of abandonment of job by the workman and once it is held so, the provisions of the Act are not attracted in this case and the management was not required to comply with the provisions of section 25-F of the Act. It is, therefore, held that the workman had himself abandoned the job by remaining absent from duty and it is not a case of retrenchment as defined in Section 2(oo) of the Act. In similar circumstances, abandonment was presumed in the authority reported as *Teja Singh vs. Punjab Water Supply and Sewerage Board and others.* 1994 FLR-146. The issue is, thus answered accordingly.

ISSUE NOS. 2, 3 & 4 :

8. All these issues were not pressed by the authorised representative of the management and were conceded to by him during arguments. All these issues are, therefore, answered against the management.

ISSUE NO. 5 (RELIEF) :

9. In view of my findings on the above issues, the services of the petitioner Beer Singh, were not terminated and he left the job by absenting himself and therefore, he is not entitled to any relief in this case. The reference is answered accordingly, with no order as to costs.
Dated, the 2nd November, 1994.

B. R. VOHRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

Endorsement No. 2330, dated the 7th November, 1994.

A copy, with spare copy, is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh for necessary action.

B. R. VOHRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

No. 14/13/87-6Lab./947.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-cum-Labour Court, Hisar, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of The Managing Director, CONFED, Haryana, Chandigarh v. Atma Ram.

BEFORE SHRI B. R. VOHRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, HISAR.

Reference No. 94 of 90

Date of Receipt : 25.7.89

Date of Decision : 2.11.94.

SHRI ATMA RAM, SON OF KISHAN LAL, C/O MAZDOOR EKTA UNION, HISAR

... Applicant.

versus

(1) MANAGING DIRECTOR, CONFED, HARYANA, CHANDIGARH.

(2) DISTRICT MANAGER, CONFED, HISAR.
... Respondent/Management.

Present :

Shri Bhagwat Dayal, for the workman.
Shri P. C. Bansal, for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short, 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana, referred the following dispute between Atma Ram and the above mentioned management for adjudication to this Court,—vide Labour Department letter No. Hsr/161-89/29130-136, dated 5th July, 1989 :—

Whether termination of services of Atma Ram is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. According to the workman, he was appointed as Salesman by the management on 29th April, 1981 and on the allegation that he had embezzled some amount, he was removed from service in May, 1984. According to the workman, there had been arbitration proceedings with regard to the charge of embezzlement levelled against him and that ultimately, he had been exonerated of the charges levelled against him, vide orders dated 30th June, 1988 of Assistant Registrar,

Co-operative Societies (for short, 'ARCS'), and dated 23rd March, 1989 of Deputy Registrar, Co-operative Societies (for short, 'DRCS') Hisar. He has, therefore, prayed for reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. The management, in its written statement pleaded that Atma Ram, workman had embezzled the funds of Confed as reported by General Manager, Hisar and that he had also misappropriated the sale proceeds of Kerosene Oil worth Rs. 5,000. The workman was also stated to have absented from duties and that on the ground of misconduct, his services were dispensed with,—vide order dated 7th May, 1984. It was stated that the management had filed revision petition before Joint Secretary to Government, Haryana, Co-operation Department, Chandigarh against the orders dated 30th June, 1988 of ARCS and dated 23rd March, 1989 of DRCS, Hisar and that the workman was evading service of summons in that revision petition. Several preliminary objections were also raised by the management, as they are reflected in the following issues framed on 7th January, 1991 by my learned predecessor:—

- (1) As per terms of reference.
- (2) Whether the petition is not maintainable in view of the preliminary objection No. 1 to 4?
- (3) Whether the workman embezzled the amount? if so, to what effect?
- (4) Relief.

4. The parties led evidence in support of their rival claims. I have heard Shri Bhagwat Dayal, Authority Representative of the workman and Shri P. C. Bansal, Authority Representative of the management and have gone through the case file. My findings on the above issues are as under:—

ISSUE NO. 1 :

5. It is not disputed that the workman was appointed as Salesman in April, 1981 and that his services were terminated,—vide order dated 7th May, 1984. It is also admitted by Jai Parkash Goel Store Keeper, who appeared as MW-3 that no charge-sheet was served upon the workman on account of alleged shortages and no enquiry was held. It is also admitted by him that on account of the charge of absence also, the workman was not charge-sheeted, nor any enquiry was conducted against him.

6. It is borne out from the termination order Ex. MW-10 that the services of the workman

were terminated on the basis of the report of the General Manager, Hisar, holding that the workman was guilty of misconduct. Admittedly the termination order was passed without conducting any domestic enquiry and in this way, termination order results in "retrenchment" under Section 2(00) of the Act, and since admittedly the provisions of Section 25-F of the Act were not complied with, the termination of services of the workman is illegal and null and void.

7. So far as the plea of the management that the workman remained absent from duties, is concerned, it is equally true that no domestic enquiry was held for this charge. In *L. Robert D'Souza v. The Executive Engineer Southern Railway and another*, AIR 1982-SC-854, the Supreme Court held that where the service of a person is terminated on account of his alleged absence from duty without holding an enquiry, such termination is liable to be quashed on the ground of violation of the principles of natural justice. The same view has been expressed in *D. K. Yadav v. J.M.A. Industries Ltd.* 1993(4) S.L.R.-126.

8. So far as the testimony of Vir Bhan, MW-1 and Ram Chander, MW-2 are concerned, they have deposed about certain shortages found against the workman. It is not disputed that arbitration proceedings were commenced with regard to those shortages and it has come in evidence that those proceedings were decided in favour of the workman by ARCS and DRCS, Hisar and the management had filed revision petition before Joint Secretary, Co-operation Department and the said petition is still pending decision. Obviously, the relief of reinstatement could not be awarded in those arbitration proceedings.

9. In the light of discussion above, the termination of services of the workman is held illegal, being in violation of Section 25-F of the Act and he is entitled to reinstatement. As regards back wages, it has come in evidence that the workman raised the demand notice only on 8th April, 1989, when his services were terminated on 7th May, 1984. Although the workman has stated that he remained pursuing the arbitration case, but as already stated above, the relief of reinstatement and back wages could not be granted in those proceedings, as the workman has not raised demand notice for about 5 years. he will not be entitled to back wages prior to 8th April, 1989, the date of raising demand notice.

The workman shall, however, be entitled to other consequential benefits, if any. The issue is decided accordingly.

ISSUE NO. 2 :

10. This issue was not pressed by the Authority Representative of the workman and was conceded to by him during arguments. This issue is, therefore, decided against the management.

ISSUE NO. 3 :

11. The testimony of Ram Chander, MW-2 has a bearing on this issue and according to him, shortages were found against the workman. It is, however, admitted by him that the arbitration proceedings were decided in favour of the workman by ARCS and DRCS, Hisar respectively and that revision had since been filed by the management against those orders and the said revision is pending. There is, thus, no conclusive evidence on file to prove that the workman has embezzled some amount. As such, I have no hesitation in answering this issue against the management.

ISSUE NO. 4 RELIEF :

12. In view of my findings on the above issues, the termination of services of the petitioner is held illegal. The same is hereby set aside. The petitioner is reinstated in the same post forthwith, with benefit of continuity of service and other consequential benefits. The petitioner shall however not be entitled to any wages for the period from 7th May, 1984 to 7th April, 1989. He shall be entitled to full back wages from 8th April, 1989 onwards. The reference is answered accordingly, with no order as to costs.

The 2nd November, 1994.

B. R. VOHRA,
Presiding Officer.
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

Endorsement No. 2362, dated the 7th November, 1994.

A copy, with spare copy, is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government Haryana, Labour and Employment Department Chandigarh, for necessary action.

B. R. VOHRA.
Presiding Officer.
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

The 29th November 1994.

No. 14/13/87-6 Lab./949.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Hisar, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s The Ding Co-operative Marketing C/P Society, Sirsa vs. Hawa Singh.

BEFORE SHRI B. R. VOHRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, HISAR.

Reference No. 132 of 90

Date of Receipt : 3.4.89

Date of Decision : 2.11.94

SHRI HAWA SINGH, SON OF SANKAR LAL,
C/O SHRI K. J. SINGLA, ADVOCATE, SIRSA,
... Applicant.

versus

THE DING CO-OPERATIVE MARKETING C/P
SOCIETY, SIRSA, ... Respondent/Management.
Present :

Shri Bhagwat Dayal, for the workman.
Shri Anand Goel, for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of Sub-Section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Hawa Singh and the above mentioned management for adjudication to this Court,—vide Labour Department Letter No. Hsr/84-89/15423--28, dated 31st March, 1989 :—

Whether termination of services of Hawa Singh is justified and in order ? If not to what relief is he entitled ?

2. According to the workman, he was appointed as Salesman by the management on 23rd December, 1985 and his services were terminated on 16th June, 1986 without assigning any reason. He was again appointed on 29th July, 1986 and had worked as such upto 31st October, 1986, on which date he was relieved/retrenched from service. It is, further stated that he was appointed again for two spells more i.e. from 20th April, 1987 to 30th June, 1987 and then from 3rd November, 1987 to 8th March, 1988, when he was removed from job, without holding any enquiry and without hearing him. The workman has stated that termination of his services was illegal and was *malu fide*, as after his termination, one Rajinder Kumar, who was a close relative of one inspector, was appointed in his place.

The workman further stated that the termination of his services was made in violation of Section 25-F and 25-G of the Act. He, therefore, prayed for reinstatement with full back wages and other benefits.

3. The management, in its written statement, stated that the applicant was never appointed against a permanent post. On the other hand, his services were availed of from time to time on temporary basis on daily wages for specific work and when the job for which he was engaged, stood accomplished, he was discharged from duties. It was, however, admitted that the workman was lastly appointed on 3rd November, 1987 and was relieved on 8th March, 1988 without completing 240 days service. It was, therefore, stated that it was not a case of retrenchment. In the additional plea, it was pleaded that the reference was not maintainable as the workman had already approached the Civil Court for the adjudication of the matter in controversy.

4. On the pleadings of the parties, the following issues were framed on 23rd October, 1990 by my learned predecessor :—

- (1) As per terms of reference.
- (2) Whether the petitioner approached the Civil Court ? If so, to what effect ?
- (3) Relief.

5. The parties led evidence in support of their rival claims. I have heard Shri Bhagwat Dayal, authorised representative of the workman and Shri Anand Goel, authorised representative of the management and have gone through the case file. My findings on the above issues are as under :—

ISSUE NO. 1 :

6. Hawa Singh, who appeared as WW-1, has stated that he was appointed as Salesman four times and that he worked for the period detailed below :—

- (1) 28th December, 1985 to 16th June, 1986
- (2) 29th July, 1986 to 31st October, 1986
- (3) 20th April, 1987 to 30th June, 1987
- (4) 3rd November, 1987 to 8th March, 1988

He further deposed that no notice was given to him before removing him from the job.

7. Dhayan Chand, manager, was examined as MW-1 and while testifying various documents Ex. M 1 to Ex. M-8, he deposed that the workman was appointed for different intervals to

meet the demand of seasonal work and according to him, the workman was now working as salesman on regular basis in Fatehabad Co-operative Society, Fatehabad and has claimed that while working in Fatehabad Society on 14th November, 1992 as Manager of that Society, he had issued the certificate Ex. M-7 at the instance of management of this case. He also stated that the workman had earlier worked for some time in Kalanwali Society as per certificate Ex. M-8.

8. When the arguments were heard, the workman was present in the Court and when he was confronted with the certificate Ex. M-7, he admitted that he was now working as regular salesman in Fatehabad Society. It also stands established from Ex. M-8 that Hawa Singh had worked in Kalanwali Society as Salesman from 1st August, 1988 to 17th August, 1988.

9. During arguments, it was not disputed by Shri Anand Goel, authorised representative of the management that the workman had worked for 231 days during the preceding 12 months prior to 8th March, 1988, the date of last termination and in this way, the workman had not completed 240 days job during the preceding 12 months prior to 8th March, 1988. Even otherwise, the workman is now employed as salesman on regular basis in Fatehabad Society and as such, the relief of reinstatement has become redundant in this case.

10. The workman raised the demand notice on 12th January, 1989 and though he got fresh appointment in February, 1991, but he concealed this material fact, though more than 3 years have now passed since then. As the workman has not completed 240 days job prior to 8th March 1988, the provisions of the Act are not attracted in this case and it can not be said that termination of services of the workman, in any way, was illegal. Even if it be assumed that the termination of services of the workman was an act of unfair labour practice, as the workman is already employed, he is not entitled to reinstatement and in view of his conduct in concealing the material fact and keeping in view the delay in making demand notice, he is not entitled to back wages also. This issue is answered accordingly.

ISSUE NO. 2 :

11. There is no material on the file to prove the filing of any suit by the workman and in the

absence of any evidence. I have no hesitation in answering this issue against the management.

ISSUE NO. 3 (RELIEF) :

12. In view of my findings on the above issues, the termination of services of the workman is held justified and in order and he is not entitled to any relief in this case. The reference is answered accordingly, with no order as to costs.

Dated, the 2nd November, 1994.

B. R. VOHRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

Endorsement No. 2337, dated 7th November, 1994.

A copy, with spare copy, is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh for necessary action.

B. R. VOHRA,
Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

No. 14/13/87-CLab./950.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Central Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court, Hisar, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Deputy Commissioner, Sirsa vs. Om Parkash.

BEFORE SHRI B. R. VOHRA, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, HISAR.

Reference No. 259 of 90

Date of Receipt : 30-3-1989.

Date of Decision : 2-11-1994.

SHRI OM PARKASH, SON OF BIRBAL RAM
C/O DR. SUBHASH NARULA, SADAR BAZAR,
SIRSA ... Applicant.

versus

(1) DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, SIRSA.
(2) CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, MUNICIPAL COMMITTEE, SIRSA,
... Respondent/Management.

Present :

Shri Anand Goel, for the workman.
Shri P. K. Mehta, for the management.

AWARD

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of Sub Section (1) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (for short, 'the Act'), the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between Om Parkash and the above mentioned management for adjudication to this Court,—vide Labour Department Letter No. Hsr/80-89/13392--98, dated 24th March, 1989 ;—

Whether termination of services of Om Parkash is justified and in order ? If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

2. According to the workman, he was appointed as Work-Mate by the management on 3rd June, 1987. he worked as such upto 31st March, 1988, when his services were terminated by the management in violation of the provisions of the Act. The petitioner prayed for reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits.

3. The management in its written statement, however, pleaded that the workman was appointed on daily wages and his appointment was made by Deputy Commissioner, Sirsa till the completion of the work and the workman was not kept again because there was no work. It was, therefore, stated that there was no violation of the provisions of the Act. Several preliminary objections were also raised, as they are reflected in the following issues framed on 5th February, 1991 by my learned predecessor :—

(1) As per terms of reference.

(2) Whether the M.C. respondent is not industry ?

(3) Whether the petition is barred by time?

(4) Whether the petition is not maintainable ?

(5) Relief.

4. In this case, the management was proceeded against *ex parte* and the *ex parte* award was passed on 25th May, 1992. On an application filed by the management, the said *ex parte* award was set-aside,—vide order dated 8th June, 1994.

5. The parties led evidence in support of their rival claims. I have heard Shri Anand

Goel, Authorised Representative of the workman and Shri P. K. Mehta, Authorised Representative of the management and have gone through the case file. My findings on the above issues are as under :—

ISSUE NO. 1 :

6. Om Parkash appeared as WW-1 and has stated that he was appointed by the management as Mate on 3rd June, 1987 and that he was removed from the job on 31st March, 1988 without serving him any notice. He, however, admitted in his cross-examination that he was appointed on daily wages. He denied the suggestion that he was removed from the job as the work was over.

7. On behalf of the management, Om Parkash was examined as MW-1 and he stated that the relevant record pertaining to the workman, had been set-asire during anti-reservation movement. He further deposed that the workman was removed from the job, when the work was completed.

8. During arguments, Shri P. K. Mehta, authorised representative of the management argued that the appointment of the workman having been made for a specific period and for specific work, the termination of services of the workman did not amount to "retrenchement" as he was removed from the job, when the work was accomplished. Although this argument of the authorised representative of the management is seemingly attractive, but the same has been rejected on the ground of vagueness, because in the written statement, it has not been specifically pleaded as to for what specific job Om Parkash was employed and when the said job was accomplished. Even Om Parkash, MW-1 is not aware as to for what specific work the workman was employed and Om Parkash, MW-1 has shown ignorance in this connection in his cross-examination. It is settled law that the provisions of Section 2(oo) (bb) of the Act are to be applied strictly and only on production of positive evidence and the said exception can not be invoked by the management on vague pleas so as to defeat the rights, which had accrued to the workman under the Act. It is, therefore, held that the management has failed to prove that the present case fell under exceptional clause (bb) of Section 2(oo) of the Act. The workman had pleaded specifically having worked from 3rd June, 1987 to 31st March, 1988 and this plea was not specifically denied either in the written statement, or in the evidence led by the management. The statement of the workman, that he had worked

from 3rd June, 1987 to 31st March, 1988, shall, therefore, prevail and it stands established that the workman had worked for more than 240 days prior to 31st March, 1988 and he was, thus, protected under the provisions of the Act. Obviously, his services could not be terminated without following the mandatory provisions of Section 25-F of the Act and non-compliance of mandatory provisions of the Act had rendered the termination of services of the workman as illegal. The workman is, thus, entitled to reinstatement with full back wages and other consequential benefits. The issue is answered accordingly, in favour of the workman.

ISSUE NOS. 2, 3 & 4 :

9. All these issues were not pressed by the authorised representative of the management and were conceded to by him during arguments. All these issues are, thus, answered against the management.

ISSUE NO. 5 (RELIEF) :

10. In view of my findings on the above issues, the termination of services of the petitioner is held illegal. The same is hereby set-aside. The petitioner is reinstated in the same post forthwith, with full back wages and benefit of continuity of service and other consequential benefits. The reference is answered accordingly, with no order as to costs.

Dated, the 2nd November, 1994.

B. R. VOHRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

Endorsement No. 2332, dated, the 7th November, 1994.

A copy, with spare copy, is forwarded to the Financial Commissioner and Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Department, Chandigarh for necessary action.

B. R. VOHRA,

Presiding Officer,
Industrial Tribunal-cum-
Labour Court, Hisar.

P. R. KAUSHIK,

Financial Commissioner and
Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour and Employment Department.